REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated October 1, 2004 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 5, 15-18, 21, 22, 40-42, and 47-50 are hereby amended. Accordingly, claims 1-58 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terada et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,276,541) in view of Sato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,259). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 is patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. in that claim 1 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "arranging a mask over a first plurality of liquid crystal display panels, wherein a plurality of openings are provided within the mask; forming a plurality of seal patterns on the first plurality of liquid crystal display panels in correspondence with the plurality of openings within the mask; arranging the mask over a second plurality of liquid crystal display panels; and forming a plurality of seal patterns on the second plurality of liquid crystal display panels in correspondence with the plurality of openings within the mask." Neither Terada et al. nor Sato et al., singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3-5, which depend from claim 1, are also patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 6-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and further in view of Zhang (U.S. Patent App. Pub. No. 2003/0231277). This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, which as discussed above, is patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. Zhang is asserted by the Examiner as disclosing a feature recited in claim 2. Without reaching the merits of this assertion, Applicants respectfully submit that Zhang

fails to cure the above-cited deficiency of Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. as applied to independent claim 1 above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 which depends from claim 1, is patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and further in view of Zhang.

Claim 15 is patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and Zhang in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "preparing a base substrate including a first liquid crystal display panel having a first size and a plurality of second liquid crystal display panels each having a size different from the first size; ... arranging a second mask over a first group of the plurality of second liquid crystal display panels, wherein a plurality of openings are provided within the second mask; and forming a first plurality of second seal patterns on the first group of the plurality of second liquid crystal display panels in correspondence with the plurality of openings within the second mask." Neither Terada et al., Sato et al., nor Zhang, singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 16-35, which depend from claim 15, are also patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and Zhang.

Claim 42 is patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and Zhang in that claim 42 recites a combination of elements including, for example, "preparing a base substrate including at least one first liquid crystal display panel having a first size and at least one second liquid crystal display panel having a second size, different from the first size, wherein the number of first liquid crystal display panels included within the base substrate is different than the number of second liquid crystal display panels included within the base substrate; arranging a first mask over at least one first liquid crystal display panel, wherein at least one opening is provided within the first mask; ... arranging a second mask over at least one second liquid crystal display panel, wherein at least one opening is provided within the second mask, wherein the number of openings provided within the second mask is different than the number of openings provided within the first mask." Neither Terada et al., Sato et al., nor Zhang, singly or in combination, teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 43-58, which depend from claim 42, are also patentable over Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and Zhang.

As set forth at M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, each claim limitation must be taught or suggested by the references when combined to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. However, in rejecting claim 36, the Examiner acknowledges that Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. fails to disclose "a first panel as having a size greater than a second panel and the method of arranging a second mask over the second ... panel." While this may be true, Applicants respectfully submit that Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. also fails to teach or suggest what is actually recited in claim 36 (e.g., "arranging a first mask over the first region of the base substrate, wherein openings are provided within the first mask," "arranging a second mask over the second region of the base substrate, wherein openings are provided within the second mask," etc.).

Continuing the rejection of claim 36, the Examiner cites Zhang as teaching "a liquid crystal display panel manufacturing process in which multiple panels of different sizes are manufactured on a single base substrate." Even if Zhang teaches what it alleged to teach, Applicants respectfully submit that Zhang fails to cure the above-noted deficiency of Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. with respect to what is actually recited in claim 36. Because neither Terada et al., Sato et al., nor Zhang teach or suggest at least the aforementioned elements of claim 36, the combination of Terada et al. in view of Sato et al. and further in view of Zhang cannot teach or suggest each and every element recited in claim 36. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As set forth in M.P.E.P. § 2143.03, if an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 37-41, which depend from claim 36, are also nonobvious under § 103.

Applicants believe the foregoing remarks and amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: December 27, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____

Kurt M. Eaton
Registration No.: 51,640
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorney for Applicant